

backgrounds in established industry, startup companies, consulting groups, non-profits, academia, government, medical research, and venture capital from around my home State of California, which is a leader in the field of nanotechnology.

Nanotechnology has the potential to create entirely new industries and radically transform the basis of competition in other fields, and I am proud of my work with former Science Committee Chairman Sherry Boehlert on the Nanotechnology Research and Development Act of 2003 to foster research in this area.

But one of the things I have heard from experts in the field is that while the United States is a leader in nanotechnology research, our foreign competitors are focusing more resources and effort on the commercialization of those research results than we are.

In its report Thinking Big About Thinking Small, which can be found on my website, the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Nanotechnology made a series of recommendations for ways that the Nation can promote the development and commercialization of nanotechnology. The NANO Act includes a number of these recommendations.

In addition, the bill addresses concerns that have been raised about whether the Federal Government is doing enough to address potential health and safety risks associated with nanotechnology. The NANO Act requires the development of a nanotechnology research strategy that establishes research priorities for the Federal Government and industry that will ensure the development and responsible stewardship of nanotechnology. This strategy will help to resolve the uncertainty that is one of the major obstacles to the commercialization of nanotechnology—uncertainty about what the risks might be and uncertainty about how the Federal Government might regulate nanotechnology in the future.

The NANO Act also includes a number of provisions to create partnerships, raise awareness, and implement strategic policies to resolve obstacles and promote nanotechnology. It will: create a public-private investment partnership to address the nanotechnology commercialization gap; establish a tax credit for investment in nanotechnology firms; authorize a grant program to support the establishment and development of nanotechnology incubators; establish a Nanoscale Science and Engineering Center for “nano-CAD” tools; establish grant programs for nanotechnology research to address specific challenges in the areas of energy, environment, homeland security, and health; establish a tax credit for nanotechnology education and training program expenses; establish a grant program to support the development of curriculum materials for interdisciplinary nanotechnology courses at higher education institutions; direct NSF to establish a program to encourage manufacturing companies to enter into partnerships with occupational training centers for the development of training to support nanotechnology manufacturing; and call for the development of a strategy for increasing interaction on nanotechnology interests between DOE national labs and the informal science education community.

I look forward to working with Science, Space and Technology Committee Chairman HALL and Ranking Member JOHNSON on this bill and their committee's other efforts to reauthorize the Nation's nanotechnology research and development program.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 327 I was unable to cast my vote on the House floor because I was ill.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

THANK YOU BRAD LEAKE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Brad Leake for his hard work and service to the people of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. After working in the Midlands District office in West Columbia for over two and half years, Brad will be leaving on August 16th to work for the South Carolina Department of Social Services.

Brad began interning in the Washington office before becoming a caseworker in the Midlands District office. As a caseworker, Brad served as an important voice and liaison between constituents and federal agencies. Frequently, he would inquire to federal agencies on behalf of constituents on important issues such as receiving Social Security benefits and veterans' affairs information.

Finally, I would like to thank Brad for his role in successfully serving as Deputy Campaign Manager for my campaign during the 2008 cycle.

It is with sincere appreciation that I would like to thank Brad and his wife, Emily, all the best as you enter this next phase of your life.

IN HONOR OF LANCE CORPORAL
ERIK GALVAN, AN AMERICAN
HERO

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of an American hero, Lance Corporal Erik Galvan, USMC of the 1/5 Bravo Company.

While out on patrol in Sangin, Afghanistan on June 15, 2011, Lance Corporal Galvan was struck by an IED explosion and lost his right hand and both his legs. Thanks to quick response and attentiveness of his fellow soldier, Sergeant Joshua Yarbrough, his life was saved. Sergeant Yarbrough immediately placed tourniquets on all of the lost limbs and then proceeded to assist another injured Marine who also lost both legs after stepping on an IED. Lance Corporal Galvan's family has a history of public service. His older brother, Lance Corporal Edward Galvan, is also with the United States Marine Corps. With the love and support of his family and friends, Lance Corporal Galvan exhibits great strength and perseverance and now hopes to become a

Crime Scene Investigator upon his full recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in recognizing Lance Corporal Galvan. No words can fully express our gratitude for the sacrifice of our brave and dedicated service men and women. May our thoughts and prayers be with Lance Corporal Galvan as he recovers from his injuries.

SUCH LIGHT

(By Albert Caswell)

Such . . .
Such Light . . .
All in that fight . . .
But, comes such heroes . . . who but bring
their light!
Shining all there in the darkness of war, so
bright!
Oh . . . Oh . . . Such Light!
As you Erik, have but brought to this our
world . . . this night
All in your most sacred sacrifice, all in this
light!
Which burns so bright, burns so bright!
All in your most magnificent Shades of
Green . . .
As there as seen, all in honor's light!
To win that battle, to win that fight!
As when such hearts of valor do so ignite!
As you so walked into the darkness of war's
dark light!
All for God and Country and what is right
. . . is right!
Such Light!
And then as you lay dying!
Somehow your heart of brilliance, so kept on
trying!
To win that fight!
To live on into this world, but to bright your
light . . .
Because you are a
United States Marine, who can win any
fight!
All for yourself and family, and lost Brothers
In Arms,
like Nic O'Brien who died in that fight!
All in their most gallant . . . most gallant
light!
And though you have lost your two strong
legs . . .
And hand, you won't moan or beg!
Because all inside of you our Lord so gave!
So gave such light!
To So Teach Us . . .
To So Beseech Us . . .
To So Reach Us . . .
All in Such Light!
And if ever I
have a
son . . .
I pray his life has shown . . .
Has shown . . .
Such Light!

HISTORY OF A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the current budget situation is most poignant when looking at the origins of the Balanced Budget Amendment and its history.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to my colleague's across the aisle present the Republican Study Committee's budget this morning, I'm apt to wonder what it is they're studying over there. Hopefully I'll be able to set the record straight.

As a reaction to FDR's New Deal, Republican Congressman Harold Knutson of Minnesota introduced the first version of the amendment in 1936. Like many Constitutional Amendments, this resolution did not receive a hearing or a vote. During President Dwight D. Eisenhower's first term, the Judiciary Committee of a barely Democratic Senate held its first hearing on this amendment. It again did not receive a vote.

After these partial defeats, BBA supporters shifted their focus to the states. From 1975 to 1980, 30 state legislatures passed resolutions calling for a constitutional convention to propose this Amendment directly to the states.

The election of President Reagan and a Republican Senate in 1980, renewed hopes for the Balanced Budget Amendment and passage by Congress. While the Senate did adopt the amendment in 1982, it failed to garner the necessary three-fifths majority in the House. This failure energized conservative groups such as the National Taxpayers Union and the National Tax Limitation Committee to refocus on state action.

In 1982 and 1983, the Alaska and Missouri legislatures passed resolutions supporting the BBA, bringing the total number of these resolutions to 32, two short of the 34 needed for a convention. However, a growing concern about the scope of a constitutional convention led some states to withdraw their resolutions, re-shifting focus to Congressional action.

From 1990 to 1994, Congress would make three additional attempts to codify this amendment. All failed to garner the necessary three-fifths majority.

However, the BBA made a comeback when it was included in Newt Gingrich's Contract with America. Twenty-six days after taking office, the newly empowered Republican majority adopted the BBA, giving conservatives their first Congressional win in a decade. Disappointment awaited in the Senate, where two separate votes fell just short of adoption. This failure, along with the balanced budget and the Budget surplus at the decade's end, sapped any remaining Congressional support for the BBA.

There was renewed Republican support for the amendment in 2000 as it was included in party's platform. The Bush Tax Cuts, wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the massive deficit spending created by them eventually led Republicans to sweep the Balanced Budget Amendment black under the rug. By 2004, the Republican Party left any mention of a balanced budget out of their platform.

Again in recent years, with the advent of the Tea Party and the return of extreme fiscal conservatism in the Republican party, there are currently twelve Balanced Budget Amendments in the House and three in the Senate.

I had my staff double check that for me. 12 Balanced Budget Amendments in the House. They are all basically the same. Some have even been offered by members of my own party.

I understand these Members' frustration, Mr. Speaker.—I've been trying pass my nine Amendments to the Constitution for 10 years now and my Amendments are based on FDR's "2nd Bill of Rights" which he proposed back in 1944. Today, 67 years later, here we are.

Mr. Speaker, I fundamentally believe that conservatives in congress are pushing for this amendment, not to force a vote in congress, but to rally states to act.

Mr. Speaker, we have a troubling national debt and deficit. But the Balanced Budget Amendment is not the solution.

The argument proponents of Balanced Budget Amendment make is as follows: like families, businesses, and states, the federal government should balance its budget. But since it does not, we need a constitutional amendment to guarantee that it will do so.

Nearly every state in this Union has some form of a balanced budget requirement. But those states are not out of debt. Their amendments have restricted their ability to care for their citizens in times of austerity or emergency.

According to a Forbes analysis of the global debt crises in January of 2010, every single state in the country is carrying some form of debt. These debts range from as little as \$17 per capita in Nebraska to \$4,490 in Connecticut.

How can this be, Mr. Speaker? It's because the infrastructure of these states allows them to hide debt in Capital Funds. The federal government cannot, and I would argue the federal government should not follow this path.

Congress should never seek to hide the fiscal realities from the public that bear the burden of the cost. Nor should we sell the public magic beans that a Balanced Budget Amendment will make the national debt and other problems go away. Debt will exist just as new problems will arise.

In the fiscal year 2012, approximately 44 states will face revenue shortfalls. Many are desperately looking for ways to declare their state bankrupt. Bankrupt, I say it again, Mr. Speaker, because this proposed amendment would place the federal government in a similar predicament. The effect in many states is calamitous.

For instance in Rhode Island, judges and court workers have cut pay and left 53 positions unfilled. This is still not enough to balance their budget. As a desperate last resort, the Chief Justice has begun to dispose of cases on backlog. Literally, just tossing them out. Florida is in the same predicament.

Mr. Speaker, a Balanced Budget Amendment would force the federal government to deny Americans the right to seek redress and justice in federal courts, for the sake of balancing the budget.

In my home state of Illinois, mental-health services have been cut by \$91 million. Human Service directors are fearful that these cuts will cause a real public-health and public safety crisis.

Iowa, Idaho, Alabama and Ohio are considering drastic cuts to education.

My colleagues across the aisle are so concerned about handing our children and grandchildren any amount of national debt, that they have failed to realize we are setting future generations up for failure.

States are already cutting too many services that make the American workforce strong and competitive. Should the federal government do the same, our legacy will be an America that is uneducated and ill-equipped to compete on a global level.

Mr. Speaker, as exemplified by its effects on the states, this amendment may sound good on its face, but it falls flat when examined more critically.

Like an optical illusion whose image changes as you draw closer, the Balanced Budget Amendment masquerades as the sav-

ior of our budget, yet in reality threatens to permanently destroy it.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Citizens for Tax Justice, and others, a federal Balanced Budget Amendment would: Damage our economy by making recessions deeper and more frequent; Heighten the risk of default and jeopardize the full faith and credit of the U.S. government; Lead to reductions in needed investments for the future; favor wealthy Americans over middle- and low-income Americans by making it far more difficult to raise revenues and easier to cut programs; And weaken the principle of majority rule.

Therefore, passing a Balanced Budget Amendment is not a prudent path for the nation to follow.

FIVE FAULTS OF A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT OUTLINED BY CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES AND CITIZENS FOR TAX JUSTICE

HON. JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 2011

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the First Fault: a Balanced Budget Amendment would damage the economy and make recessions deeper and more frequent.

Under a Balanced Budget Amendment, Congress would be forced to adopt a rigid fiscal policy, requiring the budget to be balanced or in surplus every year, regardless of the current economic situation, or threat to the nation's security.

A sluggish economy with less revenue and more outgoing expenditures creates a deficit. As we've seen from recent events, a deficit necessitates economic stimulation to reverse negative growth.

That is why in the last session of Congress, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act invested in roads, bridges, mass transit, and other infrastructure, provided 95% of working Americans with an immediate tax cut and extended unemployment insurance and COBRA for Americans hurt by the economic downturn through no fault of their own.

If Congress were forced to function under a Balanced Budget Amendment, deficit reduction would be mandated, even more so during periods of slow or stalled economic growth, which is the opposite of what is needed in such a situation.

This consistently proposed constitutional amendment risks making recessions more common and more catastrophic for middle class families, seniors, veterans and the poor. Under such an amendment, Congress is stripped of any power to adequately respond.

The Second Fault: A BBA would risk default and jeopardize the full faith and credit of the U.S. government while simultaneously challenging the Separation of Powers.

A BBA would bar the government from borrowing funds unless a three-fifths vote in both houses of Congress permitted a raise in the debt limit. Under such a scenario, a budget crisis in which a default becomes a threat is more likely, and because of the limits placed on the fluidity of the debt ceiling, that default becomes more likely to occur.